

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 9-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4 and 6 are amended. Claims 9-11 are added. No new matter is added. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Throughout prosecution of this application, Applicants have been routinely reminded regarding their responsibilities under 37 C.F.R. §1.56 in the name of varying Requirements for Information. This Office Action specifically asserts that "[a] complete reply to the enclosed Office Action must include a complete reply to this requirement [for information]." The Office Action goes on to remind Applicants that failure to reply will result in the holding of abandonment. Applicants are aware of their responsibilities under Rule 56 to submit all information material to patentability of the subject matter of the pending claims. Apparently, early in prosecution of this application, it was asserted by the Patent Office that U.S. Patent Application No. 10/625,700 appeared to include information that may be material to patentability of the subject matter of the pending claims. A series of Requirements for Information were then levied based on the Office's assertion regarding what they may believe to be material to patentability. In this Office Action, Applicants are specifically told what information is considered to be lacking. It was Applicants' understanding that, based on the substance of a January 18, 2008 brief telephone conference with Examiner Smith, that all issues regarding the Requirement for Information were considered to be satisfied (see Applicants' January 28, 2008 Response). Applicants continue to question the ongoing assertions regarding the approach taken by this Office Action to demand what the Examiner appears to consider to be information material to patentability of the subject matter of the pending claims with the specificity outlined in the new Requirement for Information.

In an effort to put this issue to rest, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) is being concurrently submitted that addresses references currently known to Applicants that may be considered in some manner to be responsive to the ongoing Requirement for Information. With the submission of the concurrent IDS, it is understood that the Requirement for Information is satisfied.

The Office Action, on page 3, rejects claims 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,167,191 to Hull et al. (hereinafter "Hull") in view of S. Uchihashi et al., "Video Manga: Generating Semantically Meaningful Video Summaries," Proceedings of the ACM Multimedia, pp. 383-392, 1999 (hereinafter "the Uchihashi article"). The Office Action, on page 5, rejects claims 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,281 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,834,371 to Jensen et al. (hereinafter "Jensen"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a first extraction unit that extracts a character string contained in the static image data by at least one of (1) extracting text data from the static image data which has the text data, and (2) performing character recognition processing on the static image data and extracting text data which is a result of the processing; a second extraction unit that extracts the keyword input by the user from at least one of meta-data and voice index data, a first extraction performed by the first extraction unit and a second extraction performed by the second extraction unit being instructed by the user on a same screen; and a retrieval unit that matches the extracted character string with the input keyword to retrieve relevant static image data, the retrieval unit retrieving at least one of the meta-data and the voice index data that include the input keyword. The combinations of Hull and the Uchihashi article, and Chen and Jensen, cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested

this specific combination of features as positively recited in independent claim 1, and as varying recited in independent claims 4 and 6.

Hull teaches parsing a video stream and storing key frames of that video stream in order to differentiate between sections of video information (Col. 9, lines 23-34 and 54-67, and Col. 10, lines 23-36). The Office Action apparent concede that Hull fails to disclose a retrieval result display unit that displays the retrieved relevant static image data as a list of images with all of the features previously recited in the pending claims. Rather, the Office Action relies upon the Uchihashi reference as allegedly overcoming any shortfall in the application of Hull to the subject matter of the pending claims. The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reason.

The Uchihashi reference teaches only that selected keyframes are sized by importance, and then efficiently packed into a pictorial summary (Abstract). In this regard, to any extent that the Uchihashi reference can be considered to allegedly suggest varying sizes, the combination of Hull and Uchihashi cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, separate extraction units that extract differing information according to this subject matter of the pending claims. There is nothing, for example, in this combination of references that can reasonably be considered to have suggested at least a second extraction unit that extracts the keyword input by the user from at least one of meta-data and voice index data, a first extraction performed by the first extraction unit and a second extraction performed by the second extraction unit being instructed by the user on a same screen, and the retrieval unit retrieving at least one of the meta-data and the voice index data that include the input keyword as is positively recited, among other features, in independent claim 1, and varying recited as method steps in independent claims 4 and 6.

Chen teaches a slideshow presentation system at, for example, Fig. 6, where a plurality of slides in a slideshow presentation are provided in a preview window, while a

current or active slide is provided in a primary window. The Office Action concedes that Chen does not explicitly disclose extracting a character string contained in static image data by at least one of (1) extracting text data from the static image data which has the text data, and (2) performing character recognition processing on the static image data and extracting text data which is a result of the processing, as is positively recited, among other features, in independent claim 1, and varying recited as method steps in independent claims 4 and 6. The Office Action relies upon Jensen, in its teaching of adding multimedia information to slideshow presentation, as allegedly making up for this shortfall in the application of Chen to the subject matter of the pending claims. Regardless of the reasonability of this conclusion, the combination of Chen and Jensen cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, a second extraction unit, as discussed above, with all of the features a positively recited in independent claim 1, and as varying recited as method steps in each of independent claims 4 and 6.


Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either combination of the applied references, are respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 varyingly recite specifics of user manipulation of a time scale that is also neither taught, nor would it have been suggested, by any permissible combination of the applied references.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 4, 6 and 9-11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT/cfr

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Request for Continued Examination
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: October 9, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
